2001

The effects of parental attachment and parenting style on the development of violent and general deliquent behaviors in preadolescent youths

Regina Peacock

Julio Cesar Fisher

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTAL ATTACHMENT AND PARENTING STYLE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF VIOLENT AND GENERAL DELINQUENT BEHAVIORS IN PREADOLESCENT YOUTHS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Social Work

---

by

Regina Peacock

Julio Cesar Fisher

June 2001

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTAL ATTACHMENT AND PARENTING STYLE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF VIOLENT AND GENERAL DELINQUENT BEHAVIORS IN PREADOLESCENT YOUTHS

A Project

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University

San Bernardino

---

by

Regina Peacock

Julio Cesar Fisher

June 2001

Approved by:

[redacted]

Astrid Reina-Patton, Faculty Supervisor, Social Work

6/8/01
Date

[redacted]

M. Jean Peacock, Ph.D. - C.S.U.S.B.
Psychology Dept. - School Violence Project

[redacted]

Dr. Rosemary McCaslin, Ph.D.
M.S.W. Research Coordinator

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which insecure attachment formation and the laissez-faire or authoritarian parenting style predict violent or general delinquent behaviors in preadolescent youths. The present study analyzes archival data from the first wave of a longitudinal study on delinquent behaviors. Two hundred six male and female sixth grade students were surveyed. A correlation design was used to determine predictors of violent and general delinquent behaviors among these preadolescent youths. Regression analysis was used to determine which predictor offered the best explanation of violent and delinquent behavior. It was found that for boys and girls, insecure attachment was indeed significantly correlated with violent and general delinquent behaviors. However, parenting styles was not at all correlated with those behaviors in boys. Conversely, for girls, regression analysis indicated that the Laissez-faire parenting style was a more significant predictor of violent and general delinquent behaviors. These findings are important in that they may be used to help design programs to abate the rising tide of delinquency and violence among preadolescent youths. The results of this study indicate the need for parental involvement in such programs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to express our gratitude to Doctor Jean Peacock for her invaluable assistance in allowing us unfettered access to her research data and for guiding us through this process. Our appreciation also goes to Doctor Rosemary McCaslin for her sage instruction. Last, but certainly not least, we wish to thank Astrid Reina-Patton, our Faculty Supervisor, for her diligence and very competent assistance in bringing this project to completion.

With love and thanks to my wife, Tanya; my sons, David and Mychal; my aunt, Hilda Jackson; my mother, Pearl Logan; and all my relatives and friends for their love, support and encouragement.

Also, in loving memory of Aunt Winnie.

--Julio C. Fisher

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES vii

CHAPTER ONE: PROBLEM STATEMENT AND FOCUS

Problem Statement 1

Problem Focus 3

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Attachment Theory 5

Parenting Styles 11

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Study Design 19

Sample 20

Instruments 21

Procedures 24

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results 26

Discussion 30

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary 33

Conclusions 34

Recommendations 35

APPENDIX A: DEMOGRPHIC SHEET 38

APPENDIX B: FAMILY FUNCTIONING MEASURE 41

APPENDIX C: INVENTORY OF PARENT AND PEER ATTACHMENT 46

APPENDIX D: DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR MEASURE 49

APPENDIX E: INFORMED CONSENT FORM 52

APPENDIX F: DEBRIEFING INSTRUMENT 54

REFERENCES 56

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Significant Correlation Among Parental Attachment, Parenting Styles and Violent/ General Delinquent Behaviors For Girls 27

Table 2. Significant Correlation Among Parental Attachment, Parenting Styles and Violent/ General Delinquent Behaviors For Boys 27

Table 3. Simultaneous Regression Analyses of Violent and General Delinquent Behaviors for Girls 29

CHAPTER ONE

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND FOCUS

Problem Statement

Recent events that have taken place in schools across the nation have made social scientists and policy makers aware of the need to understand aggressive and violent behaviors among America's youth. At Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado on April 20, 1999, two students armed with guns and bombs killed 12 students and a teacher and wounded 23 others before taking their own lives. On March 24, 1998, in Jonesboro, Arkansas, two students ages 11 and 13 opened fire on fellow classmates and teachers outside of their Westside Middle School. When they were done four students and one teacher lay dead. On May 21, 1998 in Springfield Oregon, a 15-year-old student killed his parents at home, and then went to school where he shot and killed two students and wounded 22 others (Kennedy, 1999). More recently, a Lake Worth, Florida middle school student armed with a .25 caliber semiautomatic pistol, fatally shot a teacher in the head. These horrendous events in the nation's schools, highlight an ugly new chapter in school violence. They also serve as an extreme warning for the need to redouble efforts in understanding

the predictors of such violence among the nation's preadolescent and adolescent population.

The issue of school violence is not a new phenomenon. In the modern era, school violence has received significant attention since the early 1950's (Kennedy, 1999). However, a major difference between school violence then and now is that today a disagreement among peers is more likely to lead to the use of a weapon rather than an old-fashion fist-fight. Furthermore, in the 1950's, delinquency was comprised of stealing, bullying and infrequent forays into more violent kinds of aggressive behavior. Today, school delinquency regularly includes rape, aggravated assault, and murder (Kennedy, 1999). Just recently, between 1981 and 1990, the number of juveniles in the United States who were arrested for murder and manslaughter rose by 60 percent (Shepherd and Farrington, 1995)

In sum, violent acts committed by school-aged children appear to be worse now than ever before. At present, 10 percent of all public schools experience violent crimes including rape, murder, and attacks with a weapon (Kennedy, 1999). Also, 45 percent of elementary schools and 74 percent of high schools report violent behaviors (Kennedy, 1999). According to Curtis Lavarello a police officer with the Palm Beach County, Florida schools, "What has changed

over the years is young people's accessibility to guns." However, not all students who have access to guns commit such crimes. To the contrary, the vast majority of youth are not violent, nor have they committed acts of violence. What then are the underlying factors that nourish the roots of violence? This is a complex social issue that continues to perplex American society.

Problem Focus

Numerous studies have examined predictors of general delinquency (Braatoen, 1999; Shepherd and Farrington, 1995). The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which insecure attachment formation and parenting styles predict violent or delinquent behaviors. This study is important because current research attributes overall general delinquency to sociodemographic and family relationship variables (see Esbensen and Huizinga, 1999; Salts and Lirdfom, 1995). However recent events suggest that sociodemographic characteristics alone (e.g. urban residence, low socioeconomic status) do not explain the variability in violent delinquent behavior. This study will hold socioeconomic background constant to examine the role of parenting styles and insecure attachment formation as predictors of violent behavior among preadolescents.

This study is also crucial to the field of social work as it impacts child welfare issues. Other studies, which have considered similar variables, focus on outcomes during the late teen years or adulthood (see Kempe and Kempe 1978; Lewis, et al, 1988). It is important to know at what age violent tendencies might begin to manifest themselves so that social workers may be prepared to address these concerns. Furthermore, if parents can be shown that there are direct links between how they nurture and raise their children and the development of violent tendencies in the same children this may mitigate greater compliance with service plans offered by social services.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Attachment Theory

According to Ainsworth (1973) attachment is an ". . . affectional tie that one person forms to another specific person, binding them together in space and enduring over time." Attachment is developed within the context of a warm, loving and nurturing relationship in which the needs of the person are consistently and adequately satisfied. The first attachment humans should experience is with their mother immediately after birth. Later, during infancy, they may develop attachments with their father and other caregivers. Socialization begins with personal attachment (Elkin and Handel, 1989). The caregiver becomes the base from which the child begins to learn the social interactions that will eventually mold its character (Bowlby, 1988).

Infants who receive warm body contact, nourishment, verbal interaction, and who are responded to when they cry develop secure attachments and a sense of trust toward the world (Erikson, 1963). A child with secure attachment approaches the parent with a more positive greeting when the parent has been away, follows the parent around more, and seems to engage in more exploratory behavior when the

parent is present (Ainworth, 1977). It seems then that secure attachment consists of being happy when the parent is around and wanting to be close to the parent, but not being too upset when the parent is gone, presumably because the child is confident that the parent will return. When a child is securely attached, the child feels safe to explore his or her environment (Ainsworth, 1991).

Children who receive minimal, inadequate, or inconsistent care will develop insecure attachment and a sense of mistrust (Erikson, 1963). The insecure child cries more when the parent leaves the room and does not freely explore his or her environment when the parent is present. Such children may be described as clingy and overly close to the parent. This leads the child to cry as soon as the parent leaves the room and to feel less comforted by the parent when he or she returns (Ainsworth, 1977).

Attachment has been a popular research topic for much of the twentieth century. Researchers have long been interested in the outcomes of individuals who experienced secure or insecure bonding to parents (Bowlby, 1969; Brennan and Shaver, 1995 and Reber, 1996). Since Bowlby's development of attachment theory (1969), researchers have been instrumental in demonstrating how the working models

of attachment guide future behavior. This interest has led to numerous studies, which have suggested that secure bonding to parents is related to emotional, social and interpersonal stability (see Reber, 1996). However, these studies have primarily reported findings based on outcomes with subjects who were adults or young children. For example, insecure bonding or attachment has been shown to predict emotional, social and behavioral problems in adult life (Bowlby, 1969; Reber, 1996).

As an example of the effects of attachment in later adult life, Reber (1996) indicated that secure attachment leads to the ability of adults to form healthy interpersonal relationships and develop a trust for others. Conversely, insecure attachment leads to the inability to form healthy relationships with adults, and an overall rigid, intolerant personality (Brennan and Shaver 1995). Brennan and Shaver (1995) conducted a study to examine the relationship between attachment styles and interpersonal relationships. The subjects were 242 students attending the State University of New York at Buffalo. Two thirds of the students who participated in the study were involved in a relationship at the time of testing. Students were assessed for: (a) frustration and anger toward romantic partners; (b) seeking and enjoying physical and emotional

closeness with romantic partners; and (c) trust. The results indicated that individuals who did not perceive their bonding styles with their parents as secure were more frustrated with previous partners, were jealous and clingy, and trusted less. The results of this study support the position that insecure attachment leads to interpersonal problems in adult life (Ainsworth, 1991; Hazan and Shaver, 1990).

Further, Hazan and Shaver (1990) conducted a study to demonstrate the relationship between insecure/secure bonding and adult experiences. Subjects in this study completed a measure that classified them as secure, ambivalent or avoidant. Subjects then described the most important romance of their lives on several scales. The results indicated that adults with secure attachment patterns reported higher levels of trust in their romantic relationships whereas the other groups showed interdependence, commitment and trust problems. This study suggests that attachment patterns in infancy and childhood influence attitudes and behaviors over time.

Adult attachment patterns have also been related to personal and social well being. In one study conducted by Rice and Cummins (1996), 140 undergraduate students were recruited. Their relationship with their parents as well

as their current self-esteem levels were assessed. Regression analysis revealed that students who perceived their mothers and fathers as non-caring and avoidant tended to report current levels of low self-esteem. In general, this study concurred with the previously cited studies that associate secure attachment with stable emotional adjustment in adult life.

One may get a glimpse of how insecure (actually non-existent) attachment formation can predispose the individual toward violent or aggressive behaviors in their adult years by looking at the now famous Harlow studies (Harlow et al, 1971). Herein one sees that monkeys reared in total isolation, without even an artificial mother, grew into adults who would either cower in fright or lash out in aggression when placed with other monkeys their age. Most were incapable of mating. Female monkeys which were artificially impregnated became mothers who were often neglectful, abusive, or even murderous toward their firstborn offspring. Those that had not received love, could not give love.

Similarly, most abusive human parents report that they too were neglected or battered as children (Kempe and Kempe, 1978). Children raised in physically abusive homes often have problems with attachment formation. This may

explain why a study of 14 young men awaiting execution for juvenile crimes found that all but two had histories of brutal physical abuse (Lewis et al, 1988). Based on these studies, it seems that the inability to form close and trusting interpersonal relationships in later life, predisposes the insecurely attached individual to be more aloof and insensitive to the feelings of others and consequently more likely to engage in aggressive or violent behaviors.

Ainsworth and Bowlby (1969) suggested that secure attachment is important because it facilitates a child's affect regulation and coping skills. Moreover, these individuals grow to be less dependent on the attachment figure and more reliant on the aspect of the attachment bond. But at what age does one begin to see the manifest results of attachment formation in children? In one study, babies who were securely attached during infancy were found to be socially involved with their peers by age three and a half, often becoming leaders, and remained actively involved in their surroundings (Park and Waters, 1989). Another study reported that securely attached children approach others with positive expectations more readily than children who were not securely attached (Ainsworth, 1979, Jacobson and Wille, 1986). Follow-up observations in

preschool showed that infants who were judged to be securely attached at age one and a half were more enthusiastic, sympathetic to others, cooperative, independent, and competent than those who displayed insecure attachment at that age (Sroufe, 1978). In contrast, a child with insecure attachments may have negative expectations toward peers, acting as if their peers will be rejecting of them (Howes, Matheson, and Hamilton, 1994). Several studies have found insecurely attached children to exhibit disruptive, hostile, or aggressive behavior in preschool (Waters et al., 1993)

The impact of impaired bonding in early childhood varies. With emotional neglect and/or physical abuse in early childhood the impact can be devastating. The problems that result from this can range from mild interpersonal discomfort to profound social and emotional problems. Based on previous research that has linked insecure attachment to social and emotional problems in adults and children, it is logical to investigate the relationship between attachment styles and delinquent and violent behaviors in pre-adolescents.

Parenting Styles

After the first year of a child's life, child rearing becomes more complex. Parents have to take on the tasks of

discipline, control, and character building. Parents differ markedly from one another in how they approach these tasks. Some are warm, nurturing, and relaxed; others are cold, aloof, and tense. Some parents are highly controlling, others tend to be highly laissez-faire. Some are child-centered, highly involved in their children's lives, while others are parent centered, more occupied with their own interest and activities (Peterson and Rollins 1987). Whichever the case, the basic task for social scientist is to examine these parental styles and determine how they help shape the lives of children.

Much of our understanding on parenting styles is based on the work of Diana Baumrind (1967, 1971). She described the major dimensions or degrees of parenting styles, labeled authoritative (democratic), authoritarian (parent-centered), permissive or indulgent (child-centered), and neglecting. These are further characterized in terms of being warm versus hostile and demanding-controlling versus accepting responsive. MacCoby and Martin (1983) have also had considerable input by expanding on Baumrind's work to identify the following parenting styles based on how demanding and controlling parents are with their children: authoritative-reciprocal, authoritarian-power assertive, permissive indulgent, and permissive indifferent.

Both groups of researchers found that the authoritative/authoritative-reciprocal style is the preferred method of parenting for raising competent children. Authoritative parents combine control with acceptance and child-centered involvement (Baumrind 1967). They set high expectations for their children and request that they behave at high intellectual and social levels. However, they also combine these demands with nurturance, acceptance, and warmth. These parents solicit their children's opinions and offer explanations whenever restrictive measures are used. Research shows that children of such parents tend to be independent, self-reliant, self-controlled, explorative, content, friendly with peers and successful intellectually and socially (Baumrind 1967; Rollins and Thomas 1979).

Patterson and Leeber (1984) conducted a study to examine violence-related behaviors of adolescents in relations with responsive and demanding parents. Responsiveness was operationalized as high parental involvement and parental attention to the child's emotional developmental needs. Demandingness was operationalized as active monitoring, supervision and setting and enforcing clear standards of behavior. The study was conducted with 2,434 students enrolled in 14 different middle and high

schools. The results indicated that the higher the perceived responsiveness and demand of the parent, the lower the likelihood that the adolescent would engage in delinquent behavior (e.g., hit peers, carry weapons). Conversely, adolescents who perceived low levels of these dimensions were three times more likely to report delinquent behaviors. The results of this study support the position that authoritative parenting styles lead to adaptive behavior patterns among adolescents.

The concept of authoritarianism arose in an effort to explain the psychological attraction that the Nazi ideology had for many individuals (Feshbach and Weiner, 1986). The American Jewish Committee was interested in researching the compliant behavior of Germans towards Hitler (Adorno, 1950). Their impression was that the Nazi's racist belief and antidemocratic ways developed from a particular personality syndrome called authoritarian personality. This personality type is characterized by a rigid adherence to conventional values, exaggerated need to submit to authority, generalized hostility, and an unacceptance of different ethnic groups (Adorno, 1950). This pattern was thought to stem from early rearing by a domineering father and punitive mother who punished the child harshly for any disobedience. Thus, as an adult the individual repeats the

whole experience (Adorno, 1950). In other words, he or she also bullies and punishes people who are deviant and disobedient.

According to Baumrind (1971), children reared by an authoritarian parent grow to be dependent and lack motivation, and also show links to aggressive behavior. Children from authoritarian homes appeared to be discontented, aimless, withdrawn, fearful, and distrustful (Baumrind, 1971).

Collins and Coltrane (1995) described the social pattern of an authoritarian household, which fosters and makes it hard to eradicate violence. These families are organized around localized encapsulated networks where there is a sharp segregation between male and female roles. This traditional structure produces a high degree of pressure for conformity. People take their positions as rigidly fixed and immutable. They tend to see the world moralistically, with traditional behavior clearly marked as "right" and any other kind of behavior as "wrong." They draw a rigid line between the positions of parents and children and believe the power of the parent should be strongly enforced. Violence in this type of family also has a symbolic significance. It is a way of ritually acting out the traditional authority relationships. It is a

ritual for putting the tradition back in order. Both parents and children become firmly attached to these rituals; children even grow up with a sentimental admiration for how tough their father was (Collins and Coltrane, 1995).

In a study conducted by Peterson and Rollins (1987) the effects of parenting practices, particularly support and control, on the development of delinquent behaviors, were examined. Subjects in this research were called on the phone using a Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing network (CSTI). Trained researchers interviewed a sample of 699 adolescents and their families in Buffalo, New York. Control was defined as parental behaviors towards the child, which are intended to direct the child's behavior in a manner acceptable to the parent. The construct "support" was defined as behaviors towards the child that were loving, accepted and valued. The results of this study indicated that when adolescents perceived their parents as controlling and coercive there was a highly significant positive linear correlation to deviance and school misconduct. Conversely, there was an inverse relationship between authoritative parenting and unwanted behaviors. The highest levels of parental monitoring and support were associated with the lowest instances of drinking, drug use,

and school misconduct. In general, this study supports the position that authoritarian parenting styles (where support is low and monitoring is high) is associated with the most problem behavior (Peterson and Rollins, 1987).

Permissive or indulgent parents are child-centered parents who place fewer demands on their children (Baumrind, 1971). These children have positive moods and show more vitality than children who are raised in authoritarian environments. However, they tend to be immature and lack impulse control (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Children raised in permissive households also tend to be more impulsive and aggressive and the least self-reliant and explorative (Baumrind, 1971).

The fourth category identified by Baumrind (1971) is the neglecting parent. Such parents are concerned with their own activities and are not active participants in their children's lives. In addition, they are often unaware of their child's whereabouts, do not consider their children's opinions, and are uninterested in their child's academic activities. Pulkkinen (1988) conducted a large-scale longitudinal study in Finland, assessing the effects of parent-centered parenting on 8 to 20-year-olds. Pulkkinen found that children raised in these parent-centered households tended to be impulsive, lacked

concentration, were moody, and spent money quickly, rather than saving it. In addition, these children were uninterested in school, likely to be truant, and spent more time hanging out in the streets. This study concurred with former studies that associate parenting styles with various behavioral outcomes for children.

Taken together, attachment and parenting studies demonstrate the importance of family dynamics on the emotional and psychological development of the individual. Although human behavior is extremely complex and cannot be explained solely in terms of direct one-to-one relationships, it is reasonable to identify family variables that may bear upon the development of delinquent or violent behaviors. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between insecure attachment, parenting styles, and general delinquent and violent tendencies among preadolescent youths.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This study examined the relationships between insecure attachment and parenting styles as they relate to violent/delinquent behaviors (e.g., physical violence, homicidal thoughts, substance abuse, and burglary) in preadolescent youths. It was predicted that insecure attachments in tandem with an authoritarian or a Laissez-faire parenting style would have a positive correlation with violent and delinquent acting out behaviors among preadolescents.

The present study used archival data. The original data were collected during the first wave of a longitudinal study on delinquent behaviors (Peacock, 1999). Two hundred six male and female sixth grade students were surveyed. A self-report procedure was the most efficient way to collect the type and quantity of data of interest. Surveys allow for anonymity, which in turn encourages honesty when information is being requested on socially undesirable behaviors, such as violence and delinquency. The survey format also makes it possible to gather large amounts of data from a large population in the least amount of time.

This study used a correlational design to determine predictors of violent and general delinquent behaviors among preadolescents. Thus, the criterion variables were violent and delinquent behavior, and the major predictors were parenting styles and attachment. Regression analysis was used to determine which predictor offered the best explanation of violent and delinquent behavior.

There were several problems with this type of design: (a) No data were collected from the parents. From the data gathered, this study could only determine participant perceptions of parenting styles and attachment relationships. It is entirely possible that parents might perceive these relationships differently; (b) with self-report measures there is always the danger of social desirability and response bias. An effort was made to control these biases through the assurance of anonymity and confidentiality; (c) finally, with correlation designs one cannot make causal inferences. Although it is desirable to understand the predictors of violent/delinquent behaviors, the design used in this study can only suggest areas for further research.

Sample

Archival data from 206 sixth grade participants were used for the present study. The sample was comprised of

17% African Americans, 67% Latinos, 4% Caucasians, and 12% others. These students attended an elementary school located in a low socioeconomic rural area of Southern California. Students were given consent forms to take home to their parents. Upon returning the consent forms, students were informed that completing the questionnaire would take approximately 90 minutes of their time. All of the participants were also informed that their responses would remain completely anonymous and confidential. For their participation, the youth received $5.00 each.

Instruments

Participants completed a survey packet, which included a demographic sheet and instruments measuring parenting styles, attachment and delinquent behaviors.

Demographic Sheet

Each participant responded to questions pertaining to age, gender, ethnicity, and other personal factors. [See Appendix A]

Family Functioning

This 75-item instrument was developed by Bloom (1985) to identify dimensions of family functioning, including the three parenting style sub-scales used in this study. Each sub-scale was measured on a 5 point Likert-type scale from 1 (almost always or always true) to 5 (almost never or

never true). Each parenting style sub-scale consisted of 5 items. High scores on these measures indicated that respondents perceived their families to be highly democratic, highly authoritarian or highly laissez-faire (see Bloom, 1985). [See Appendix B]

Democratic Parenting Style. This factor examined the extent to which family members participated in decision making. This style is analogous to Baumrind's "authoritative" parenting style. A typical question used to measure this dimension is, "Adults and children in my family, discuss together the methods of punishment."

Authoritarian Parenting Style. This dimension examined the extent to which parents are the locus of making rules and decisions on punishment. An item that best represents this factor is, "We get severely punished when we do something wrong."

Laissez-faire Parenting Style. This factor determined the extent to which rules existed or failed to exist within the family. Similar to Baumrind's "permissive" parenting style, a typical item reads, "People in my family can get away with almost anything." Bloom (1985) reported average alpha coefficients of .70, .60 and .69 respectively, for these three sub-scales.

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)

The IPPA attempts to measure the importance of peer and parental attachment in adolescents and young adults by assessing the "affectively toned cognitive expectancies"(Armsden and Greenberg, 1987). The measure consists of 48 items that make up two dimensions: (1) Parental attachment; and (2) peer attachment. The 28 item Parental sub-scale was used for the present study. The items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale from 1(always true) to 5 (never true). Scoring for this measure was reversed so that high scores on this measure indicated that respondents had formed secure attachments to their parents. A typical question is, "My parents respect my feelings." Armsden and Greenberg (1987) reported 3-week test-retest reliabilities of .93 and .86, respectively, for the parent and peer attachment measures. [See Appendix C]

Delinquent Behavior Measure

McClure and Peacock (1998) compiled this 42-item measure to identify the various violent/delinquent behaviors in which preadolescents participate. The measure was based on dimensions of delinquent behaviors identified by Rowe, and Flannery (1994). For the current study, 9 items were identified as comprising the aggressive or

violent factor. A typical item representing this dimension asked respondents to scale "Hit your mother or father." The remaining 33 items made up the general delinquency dimension. Typical items here asked for responses to: "Ditched school without a proper excuse" or "Took part in a robbery." The items were measured on a Likert-type Scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). High scores on this measure indicated high levels of violent and/or delinquent behaviors. [See Appendix D]

Procedures

The original investigators who collected the data treated the participants of this study in accordance with the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct" (American Psychological Association, 1982).

The teachers announced the purpose of the study to their classes. Consent forms were then passed out to all of the students who were interested in participating. The students were instructed to return the consent forms signed by their parent/s. The consent forms stated that the study would try ". . . to identify how children deal with stressful situations." The consent forms also informed parents that their children would be given five dollars for participating in the study. Following the return of the

consent forms the teachers were contacted to arrange appropriate times to administer the questionnaire.

The data were collected from participants, in groups of twenty, in a centrally located room on campus over a two-week period. Immediately before the measures were administered, the Child Verbal Consent [See Appendix E] was read and students were asked once more if they still wanted to participate. Once the desire to participate was confirmed, the students were given their packets and asked to respond to the demographic sheet and questionnaires examining family functioning, attachment, and violent and delinquent behaviors. Upon completion, the students were debriefed and given the five-dollar incentive for participating. [See Appendix F for Debriefing Instrument.]

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study examined the relationships among parenting styles (authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire), parental attachment (secure, insecure), and delinquent behaviors (violent, general).

Results

To determine if violent and general delinquency differed based on gender, two One-Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted. There was a significant mean difference between boys ($M = 13.9$) and girls ($M = 11.17$) for violent behaviors, $F(1,197) = 10.4$, $p < .01$. Likewise, there was a significant mean difference between boys ($M = 51.3$) and girls ($M = 42.6$) for general delinquent behaviors. Boys engaged in a greater number of violent and general delinquent behaviors than did girls. Therefore, separate correlational analysis was conducted for boys and girls.

Correlational analyses for boys and girls were conducted to determine the relationship between violent and general delinquent behaviors, insecure parental attachment and parenting styles. Tables 1 and 2 show that insecure attachment was significantly associated with violent and

Table 1

Significant Correlation Among Parental Attachment, Parenting Styles and Violent/General Delinquent Behaviors For Girls

Variables	Violent Behaviors	General Delinquent Behaviors
Parental Attachment	-.26**	-.25**
Laissez-faire	.16*	.13
Democratic	.20*	.18*
Authoritarian	-.06	-.08

*p < .05, **p < .01

Table 2

Significant Correlation Among Parental Attachment, Parenting Styles and Violent/General Delinquent Behaviors For Boys

Variables	Violent Behaviors	General Delinquent Behaviors
Parental Attachment	-.20*	-.21*
Laissez-faire	-.14	-.09
Democratic	.08	.09
Authoritarian	.05	.07

*p < .05, **p < .01

general acting out behaviors for both boys and girls. Respondents who perceived their attachment to parents as being insecure tended to report engaging in more violent and/or other non-aggressive behaviors.

Table 1 also shows that parenting styles were significantly related to both violent and general acting out behaviors in girls. Specifically, the laissez-faire parenting approach was significantly ($r = .16$, $p < .05$) related to violent behaviors. Girls who described their parents' styles as Laissez-fair or somewhat neglectful tended to engage in violent behaviors but not necessarily engage in general acting out behaviors. Also, there was a significant relationship between the democratic parenting style and both violent and general delinquency ($r = .20$, $p < .05$; $r = .18$, $p < .05$, respectively). Girls who perceived that their parents practiced a democratic parenting approach tended to be involved in violent and general delinquency.

The correlation for boys showed that there was no significant relationship between parenting styles and violent or delinquent behavior.

To further explore the major predictors of violence and general delinquency, for girls, a simultaneous

regression was conducted with significant correlations (parental attachment and parenting styles) as predictors. The results of these analyses are displayed in table 3.

Table 3

Simultaneous Regression Analyses of Violent and General Delinquent Behaviors for Girls

	Violent Behaviors			
Variables	R	R^2	Standardized Beta Coefficient	t
Democratic	.36	.13	.19	1.91
Laissez-faire			.26	2.76**
Attachment			-.20	-1.97*

	General Delinquent Behaviors			
Variables	R	R^2	Standardized Beta Coefficient	t
Democratic	.33	.11	.16	1.52
Laissez-faire			.22	2.31*
Attachment			-.21	-2.01*

*p < .05, **p < .01

In terms of violent behaviors for girls, it can be seen that the democratic parenting approach did not remain

in the regression model and that the laissez-faire parenting style was a much better predictor than was insecure parental attachment. Together these two variables accounted for a small but significant 13 percent of the variance in violent behaviors. Likewise, for general delinquent behaviors in girls, the laissez-faire parenting style was a slightly better predictor of general delinquency than was insecure parental attachment. Together, these variables accounted for a modest, but again significant 11 percent of the variance.

Discussion

The finding for boys falls squarely in line with research by Anderson and Holmes (1999) which also found that "attachment to parents reduced the severity of boy's delinquency." Anderson and Holmes' research may also help explain why the present research found the Laissez-faire parenting style to be more highly correlated with violent and general delinquent behaviors in girls, than insecure attachment. That is, they found that "attachment to peers and school reduced the severity of girls delinquency." Since only parental attachment was analyzed in the present research, their finding could not be corroborated. Had peer attachment been examined, a more significant correlation with violent and general delinquent behaviors

may have been found for girls than the Laissez-faire parenting style.

On the other hand, if the difference in the significance of insecure attachment and parenting styles as correlates to delinquency in boys and girls were to persist, then some explanation should be offered. In a study by Mears and Ploeger (1998) which sought to explain the gender gap in delinquency, peer influence and moral evaluation of behavior were examined. These researchers found that ". . . both males and females are affected—though to different degrees—by a common factor: association with delinquent friends" (Mears and Ploeger, 1998). Boys however, are much more likely to have delinquent friends and are more strongly affected by delinquent peers than are females. Females were found to have the moral judgment to ". . . reduce and even eliminate the impact of delinquent peers" (Mears and Ploeger, 1998).

The above study was grounded in Sutherland's theory of differential association and Gilligan's theory of moral development. According to Mears and Ploeger, "Sutherland argued that delinquency is learned behavior and that it is learned in intimate social groups through face-to-face interaction." Gilligan's theory posits that "females are socialized in such a way that they are more constrained by

moral evaluations of behavior than are males. Whereas females are taught to care for and avoid harming others, "the driving principle of male morality is not responsibility to others, but the freedom to pursue self-interest" (Mears and Ploeger, 1998).

These theories may also explain the findings of the present study. It stands to reason that girls raised in Laissez-faire homes—where parents are uninvolved or minimally involved with their children—would be more likely to come under the influence of delinquent peers. It is also likely that girls from such households do not receive adequate moral guidance to help them resist delinquent influences. Boys, however, regardless of the parenting style in the home, are encouraged to go out more to pursue self-interest and thus have more independence in their peer associations than girls. Consequently, parenting style is much less a factor than insecure parental attachment in guiding male involvement in delinquency. Obviously more research is needed to see whether these intuitive assertions can be supported.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which insecure attachment formation and parenting styles predict violent or delinquent behaviors in preadolescent youths. Given the recent high exposure of high-profile violence in our nation's schools and a corresponding overall increase in reports of violence and delinquency among our youth it was felt that this study was important and needed. This study sought to find whether adolescent violence and delinquency was significantly correlated with the variables of insecure parental attachment and parenting styles (specifically laissez-faire and authoritarian). Based on a review of existing research data it was expected that such a link would be found.

The present study analyzed archival data from the first wave of a longitudinal study on delinquent behaviors. Two hundred six male and female sixth grade students were surveyed. Ninety six percent of the respondents were from minority homes. A correlation design was used to determine predictors of violent and general delinquent behaviors among preadolescents. Regression analysis was used to

determine which predictor offered the best explanation of violent and delinquent behavior.

The present research only partly supported initial expectations. It was found that for boys and girls, insecure attachment was indeed significantly correlated with violent and general delinquent behaviors. However, parenting styles was not at all correlated with those behaviors in boys. Conversely, for girls, regression analysis indicated that the Laissez-faire parenting style was a more significant predictor of violent and general delinquent behaviors than was parental attachment.

Conclusions

Solutions must be found to abate the rising trend in the incidence and severity of delinquency and violence among our children. American society has a tendency to assume that the source of the problem lies at the individual level, that is the child. Unfortunately, such an assumption may be ill founded. Social learning theory suggests that children are merely products of their environment. If programs are to be designed to address the issue of adolescent violence and delinquency they must understand the real precipitants of such behaviors.

This study represents a small step in that direction. To some extent it corroborates the social work creed that

it takes one caring adult to make a positive difference in a child's life. Certainly caring parents provide the warm, loving affection that nurtures secure attachment. Such parents are probably also more willing to learn parenting strategies that will predispose their children to be more law abiding. The findings of this study—though not conclusive or generalizable to the entire population—at least indicates the need for intervention strategies aimed at the parents of delinquent children. Surely if more boys could have a secure attachment to a parental figure and if more girls could have the same attachment and parental involvement in their rearing the incidences of violence and general delinquency would be reduced among these children.

Recommendations

Unfortunately the solutions to stemming the tide of juvenile delinquency are not so simple. More research needs to be done to see if the findings of the present study are replicable and if they hold true for all populations (particularly Caucasians). More important though, is the need for research to identify what prevents some parents from fostering secure attachment with their children. Along with this researchers need to learn what motivations might work best to encourage parents to adopt a democratic parenting style.

Finding the answers to these and other questions will take more time and research. Undoubtedly the age-old nature versus nurture debate will continue as social researchers and other interested parties argue over the roots of adolescent violence and delinquency. Is the behavior of these children due to inherent predisposition? Did they learn their deviant ways because of the pathology of their home environments? Are these children "bad fruit" that have fallen close to the "bad tree" that bore them?

A more radical view of social problems sees these children as the victims of a society that perpetuates classism, esteems materialism, and refuses to make the paradigm shifts required to bring an end to poverty. Such a view posits that the stigma born of classism motivates some parents to seek the material trappings of wealth at the expense of meeting the real nurturance needs of their children. This applies to all families from the rich to the poor. Parents from the poorer classes, however, are probably more likely to become hopeless and drop out of the "rat race," if in fact they were ever participants. They may then become depressed or adopt coping strategies that make them unfit to meet the parenting needs of their children.

Obviously poverty alone cannot explain juvenile delinquency. Many rich children commit delinquent acts and most poor children do behave appropriately. Neither is materialism alone the culprit. Many parents are able to devote much of their energy to earning an income while raising children who conform to social norms. If nothing else, the present research shows that no one factor will ever do to explain adolescent delinquency or the social forces that bear on families to predispose children to such behaviors. The best society can do is attack the problem bit by bit based on the findings of research such as this one.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC SHEET

Demographic Sheet

Code #_____

1. How old are you? _____

2. Are you a boy___ or a girl___?

3. How do you describe your ethnicity?
   Asian American__
   African American__
   Caucasian___
   Mexican American or Hispanic__
   Native American__
   Other__

4. How do you feel about you ethnicity?
   I love my ethnicity__
   I feel okay about my ethnicity__
   I don't like my ethnicity __
   I don't think about my ethnicity__

5. In my family, we talk about ethnicity. Never__ Sometimes__ Often__

6. Did you begin the school year at this school? Yes__ No__

7. How many schools have you been to up to now, including this one?_____

8. How many different places have you lived in up to now, including this one? ___

9. Did you have friends at this school when you entered 6th grade? Yes___ No___

10. Write the **first names** of 5 kids you consider your closest friends. If you can't think of 5 friends, write as many names that you can think of.

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

10. Where do you usually spend time with these kids? Check all that apply.
    home__
    church__
    school__
    community center__
    sports & similar activities__

11. Based on your experience, how would you describe the kids at this school?
    (a) very unfriendly__ somewhat friendly__ very friendly__
    (b) very unkind(mean)__ somewhat kind__ very kind(helpful)__

12. Based on your experience, how would you describe the teachers at this school?
    (a) very unfriendly__ somewhat friendly__ very friendly__
    (b) very unkind(mean)__ somewhat kind__ very kind(helpful)__

13. If you had a problem with your teachers at school, is there an adult that would speak up for you? Yes__ No__

14. If this adult spoke up for you, do you believe that it would make a difference? Yes__ No__

15. Is there an adult you could go to if you felt you had a problem? Yes__ No__ Who is it?
    parent/guardian__
    other family member__
    someone outside the family__

16. Name 3 of your favorite T.V. programs
    _____
    _____
    _____

17. Name 3 of your favorite video games
    _____
    _____
    _____

    How often do you get to play you favorite video game.
    (a) every day___
    (b) about 2 times a week___
    (c) more than 3 times a week___

18. The best thing I like about my school is_____

19. The one thing I don't like about this school is_____

APPENDIX B

FAMILY FUNCTIONING MEASURE

Families

Every family is different. We would like to know how it is for you in your family. After each question circle the number that seems most like your family.

	Almost Always Or Always True 1	Often True 2	Sometimes True 3	Seldom True 4	Almost Never Never True 5
1. Family members really help and support one another	1	2	3	4	5
2. Family members feel free to say what is on their mind	1	2	3	4	5
3. We fight a lot in our family	1	2	3	4	5
4. We don't go to talks, plays or concerts very much	1	2	3	4	5
5. A lot of times we go to the movies, sporting events, camping and stuff like that	1	2	3	4	5
6. People in my family go to church, synagogue or Sunday school a lot	1	2	3	4	5
7. Most of the time it is hard to find things when you need them in my home	1	2	3	4	5
8. We are full of happiness and joy	1	2	3	4	5
9. We encourage each other to be their own person	1	2	3	4	5
10. I don't think any family could get along as well as mine does	1	2	3	4	5
11. It is hard to keep track of what my family members are doing	1	2	3	4	5
12. Our family makes rules together	1	2	3	4	5
13. People in my family can get away with almost anything	1	2	3	4	5
14. My parents/guardian make all of the important decisions	1	2	3	4	5
15. We find it hard to get away from each other in my family	1	2	3	4	5
16. There is a feeling of togetherness in my family	1	2	3	4	5
17. We don't talk about our problems	1	2	3	4	5
18. People in my family some times get angry and throw things	1	2	3	4	5
19. We don't really talk about anything intelligent	1	2	3	4	5
20. Everyone in my family has special things they like to do	1	2	3	4	5
21. We don't say prayers in my family	1	2	3	4	5
22. Being on time is very important in my family	1	2	3	4	5
23. We enjoy being around other people	1	2	3	4	5
24. We are satisfied with how we live	1	2	3	4	5

	Almost Always Or Always True 1	Often True 2	Sometimes True 3	Seldom True 4	Almost Never Never True 5
25. I don't think anyone could possibly be happier than my family when we are together	1	2	3	4	5
26. In my family we always know where everyone is at all times	1	2	3	4	5
27. My family members don't feel that they have a say in solving problems	1	2	3	4	5
28. Family members are not punished when they do something wrong	1	2	3	4	5
29. There is strict punishment for breaking rules in my family	1	2	3	4	5
30. It is difficult for people in my family to do things outside of our family	1	2	3	4	5
31. We don't do things together in my family	1	2	3	4	5
32. We discuss problems in my family, and usually feel good about the solutions	1	2	3	4	5
33. Family members hardly ever lose their tempers	1	2	3	4	5
34. Watching TV is more important than reading in my family	1	2	3	4	5
35. Family members are not very involved in recreational activities outside work or school	1	2	3	4	5
36. We often talk about the religious meaning of Christmas, Passover, or other holidays	1	2	3	4	5
37. People in my family make sure their rooms are neat	1	2	3	4	5
38. Socializing with other people often makes people in my family uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5
39. We don't make our own decisions but what we do is forced on us by things we can't control	1	2	3	4	5
40. My family has all of the qualities I have always wanted in a family	1	2	3	4	5
41. People in my family don't check with each other when they make decisions	1	2	3	4	5
42. Each person in my family has some say in major family decisions	1	2	3	4	5
43. It is not clear what happens when rules are broken in my family	1	2	3	4	5

	Almost Always Or Always True 1	Often True 2	Sometimes True 3	Seldom True 4	Almost Never Never True 5
44. We get severely punished when we do something wrong	1	2	3	4	5
45. People in my family feel pressured to spend most of our free time together	1	2	3	4	5
46. We really get along well with each other	1	2	3	4	5
47. In my family it is important for everyone to express their opinion	1	2	3	4	5
48. Family members sometimes hit each other	1	2	3	4	5
49. Family members really like music, art and literature	1	2	3	4	5
50. People in my family sometimes take classes or take lessons for something they like to do	1	2	3	4	5
51. We don't believe in Heaven or Hell	1	2	3	4	5
52. As a family, we have a large number of friends	1	2	3	4	5
53. In my family, we have more than our share of bad luck	1	2	3	4	5
54. Our family is as well adjusted (normal) as any family in this world could be	1	2	3	4	5
55. People in my family are extremely independent	1	2	3	4	5
56. Adults and children in my family, discuss together the methods of punishment	1	2	3	4	5
57. It is hard to know what the rules are in my family because they always change	1	2	3	4	5
58. There are very few rules in my family	1	2	3	4	5
59. People in my family feel guilty if they want to spend time alone	1	2	3	4	5
60. The people in my family tend to avoid each other when we are home	1	2	3	4	5
61. We don't tell each other about our personal problems	1	2	3	4	5
62. People in my family rarely (don't really) criticize each other	1	2	3	4	5
63. We are very interested in cultural activities	1	2	3	4	5
64. Friends don't really come over for dinner or to visit	1	2	3	4	5
65. The Bible is a very important book in our home	1	2	3	4	5
66. For the most part, we are pretty sloppy around our house	1	2	3	4	5

	Almost Always Or Always True 1	Often True 2	Sometimes True 3	Seldom True 4	Almost Never Never True 5
67. My family likes to have parties	1	2	3	4	5
68. Members of my family feel that they don't have much control over the things that happen to them	1	2	3	4	5
69. My family could be happier than it is	1	2	3	4	5
70. People in my family are expected to get approval from others before making a decision	1	2	3	4	5
71. In my family, parents don't check with the children before making important decisions	1	2	3	4	5
72. There is strong leadership in my family	1	2	3	4	5
73. No one orders anyone around in my family	1	2	3	4	5
74. It seems like there is never any place to be alone in my house	1	2	3	4	5
75. Dishes are usually done immediately after eating	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

INVENTORY OF PARENT AND PEER ATTACHMENT

IPPA

Below are some statements about relationships with parents or your guardians and peers (people your age). Circle the answer that best fits for you.

	always true	often true	sometimes true	seldom true	never true
1. My parents respect my feelings	1	2	3	4	5
2. I feel my parents are successful as parents	1	2	3	4	5
3. I wish I had different parents.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My parents accept me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I have to rely on myself when I have a problem to take care of.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I like to get my parents' point of view on things I'm concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I feel it is no use letting my feelings show.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My parents sense when I'm upset about something.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Talking over my problems with my parents makes me feel ashamed or foolish.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My parents expect too much from me.	1	2	3	4	5
11 I get upset easily at home.	1	2	3	4	5
12 I get upset a lot more than my parents know about.	1	2	3	4	5
13. When we discuss things, my parents consider my point of view (how I see it).	1	2	3	4	5
14. My parents trust my judgment.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My parents have their own problems, so I don't bother them with mine.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My parents help me to understand myself better.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I tell my parents about my problems and troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I feel angry with my parents.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I don't get much attention at home.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My parents encourage me to talk about my difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My parents understand me.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I don't know whom I can depend on these days.	1	2	3	4	5
23. When I am angry about something, my parents try to be understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I trust my parents.	1	2	3	4	5
25. My parents don't understand what I'm going through these days.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I can count on my parents when I need to get something off my chest.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I feel that one one understands me.	1	2	3	4	5
28. If my parents know something is bothering me, they ask me about it.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I like to get my friends' point of view on things I'm concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5
30. My friends sense when I'm upset about something.	1	2	3	4	5
31. When we discuss things, my friends consider my point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Talking over my problems with my friends makes me feel ashamed or foolish.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I wish I had different friends.	1	2	3	4	5
34. My friends understand me.	1	2	3	4	5

	always true	often true	sometimes true	seldom true	never true
35. My friends encourage me to talk about my difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
36. My friends accept me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I feel the need to be in touch with my friends more often.	1	2	3	4	5
38. My friends don't understand what I'm going through these days.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I feel alone or apart when I am with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
40. My friends listen to what I have to say.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I feel my friends are good friends.	1	2	3	4	5
42. My friends are fairly easy to talk to.	1	2	3	4	5
43. When I am angry about shomething, my friends try to be understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
44. My friends help me to understand myself better.	1	2	3	4	5
45. My friends are concerned about my well-being.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I feel angry with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I can count on my friends when I need to get something off my chest.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I trust my friends.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR MEASURE

Behavior

Please read each of the following questions and say how often you have been involved in something similar. Circle the number tha fits best for you:

		Never	Once or Twice	Several Times	Often	Very Often
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Gotten alcohol by asking someone else to buy it for you?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Ditched school without a proper excuse?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Gotten drunk?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Stayed out all night?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Broken into someone's house?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Gone for a ride in a stolen car?	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Stolen a car?	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Taken part in a gang fight?	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Carried a knife or other weapon?	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Stolen things worth $5 or less?	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Stolen things worth more than $5?	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Set a fire?	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Damaged property (broken things)?	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Written on walls, doors, desks, or other places not meant for writing on?	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Hurt an animal on purpose?	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Smoked marijuana?	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Sniffed glue?	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Smoked cigarettes?	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Used hard drugs (like crack)?	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Sold marijuana or other drugs?	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Lied to get out of trouble?	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Disobeyed your parents (to their face)?	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Disobeyed teachers (to their face)?	1	2	3	4	5

		Never	Once or Twice	Several Times	Often	Very Often
		1	2	3	4	5
24.	Shouted at your mother or father?	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Cursed your mother or father?	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Hit your mother or father?	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Shouted at a teacher?	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Cursed a teacher or other adult at school?	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Hit a teacher?	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Ran away from home?	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Gotten in trouble with the police?	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Picked an argument with someone?	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Picked a physical (e.g., fist) fight?	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Made fun of or teased someone?	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Had sex (gone all the way)?	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Touched someone's private parts?	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Had someone else touch your private parts?	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Beat someone up?	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Took part in a robbery?	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Been suspended from school?	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Been expelled from a school?	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Thought about killing someone and planned how you would do it?	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Child Verbal Consent

You are being asked to be part of a research study that tries to identify how children deal with stressful situations. We know that most of you cope well with various problems, but sometimes you probably wish you could have more help. We hope that by learning more about you and your lives, we will be able to understand your strengths and the areas where parents, teachers, counselors and members of your community can know how best to help children increase their chances of succeeding and doing well in life.

This is not a test, there are no right or wrong answers, and you will not be graded on your performance. Some of the questions about stressful situations and the relationships with people in your life may be easy to answer. Some may be hard to answer. For example, we will ask you whether or not you know kids who were shot or beat up at school but you do not have to tell us who they are. We just want you to tell us about your experience so we can understand your situation. Participating in this study is completely voluntary. If you do not want to participate, are uncomfortable with a question, or don't want to finish the questionnaire, just tell me and we can talk about your concern or I will take you back to class.

Your name will not be on the answers so you don't have to worry about your friends, teachers, or others knowing what you said. We call this "confidentiality" which means that we respect your privacy. The questionnaire will take about 90 minutes to finish. We will do part one and take a break; after the break we will complete the rest. We appreciate your participation and will give you $5.00 if you choose to participate.

Now that I have explained the project, would you like to participate?

APPENDIX F

DEBRIEFING INSTRUMENT

Student Debriefing

Thank you for your participation. We are grateful for your time and effort. The questionnaire you just completed will help us understand the stress that children encounter at home, at school and in their communities. Your answers will also help us understand why some children are successfully dealing with stress and others are not. If you are interested in the results of this study or have any questions about the study, please contact Ms. Kellers and she will contact us.

If you feel uncomfortable about answering some of the questions, I want you to stay and talk to one of us about your concerns. We enjoyed meeting you, and we know that you have provided us with very important information.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunseick, E., Levinson, D., and R.N. Sanford, (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York Harper.

Ainsworth, M.D.S. and Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachments beyond infancy. American psychologist, 44, 709-716. (p.83).

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1973). The development of infant-mother attachment: A theoretical review of the infant-mother relationship. Child Development, 40, 968-1025.

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1977). Attachment as related to mother-infant interaction. In: Advances in the Study of Behavior, (Vol.9), eds., J. S. Rosenblatt, R.A. Hind, C. Beer, and M. Busnel. New York: Academic Press.

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1979). Infant-mother attachment. American Psychologist, 34, 932-937.

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1991). Patterns of infant-mother attachment as related to maternal care: Their early history and their contribution to continuity. Human development: An interactional perspective. New York: Academic Press, pp. 35-55.

Baumrind, D. (1967). Childcare practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 1, 1-103.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment. London: Hogarth.

Brennan, K., and Shaver, P. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and romantic relationship functioning. Personality and Social Psychology Bukketin, 21, 267-283.

Collins, Randall and Colrane, Scott (1995). Sociology of marriage and the family: Gender, love, and property. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

Elkin, F., and Handel, G. (1989). The child and society (5th ed.). New York: Random House.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society. New York: Norton. (p.92).

Flannery, D. J., Vazsonyi, A. T., and Rowe, D. C. (1996). Caucasian and Hispanic early adolescent substance use: parenting, personality, and school adjustment. Journal of Early Adolescence, 16, 71-89.

Jacobsen, J. L., and Wille, D. E. (1986). Influence of attachment and separation experience on separation distress at 18 months. Developmental Psychology, 20, 477-484.

Harlow, H. F. (1971). The development of affectional patterns in infant monkeys. In B.M. Foss (Ed.), Determinants of infant behavior (Vol.1). London: Methuen.

Hazan, C., and Shaver, P. R. (1990). Love and work: an attachment-theoretical perspective. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 270-280.

Holmes, S. E., and Anderson, S. A. (1994). Gender differences in the relationship between differentiation experienced in one's family of origin and adult adjustment. Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 6, 27-48.

Howes, C., Matheson, C. C., and Hamilton, C. E. (1994). Maternal, teacher, and child care history correlates of children's relationships with peers. Child Development, 65, 264-273.

Kemp, R. S., and Kempe, C. C. (1978). Child abuse. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press. (p.84).

Kennedy, A.C (199). Journal of Adolescents, Vol. 22, No.1, PP. 21-32.

Lewis, D. O., Pincus, J. H., Bard, B., Richardson, E., Prichep, L. S., Feldman, M., and Yeager, C. (1988). Neuropsychiatric, psychoeducational, and family characteristics of 14 juveniles condemned to death in the United States. American Journal of Psychiatry, 145, 584-589. (p.84)

Maccoby, E. E., and Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (ED), Handbook of Child

Psychology: Vol. 1. Socialization, personality, and social development (7th ed., pp. 1-101). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Mears, D. P., Ploeger, M., and Warr, M. (1998). Explaining the gender gap in delinquency peer influence and moral evaluations of behavior. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 35, 251-266.

Park, K. A., and Waters, E. (1989). Security of attachment and preschool friendships. Child Development, 60, 1076-1080

Patterson, G. R., and Leeber S, M. (1984). The correlation of family management practices and delinquency. Child Development, 55, 1299-1307.

Peterson, G. W., and Rollins, B.,C. (1987). Parent-child socialization. In M.B. Sussman and S. K. Steinmetz (EDS.), Handbook of marriage and the family (pp. 471-507). New York: plenum.

Pulkkinen, L., and Kinnunen, U. (1998). Linking economic stress to marital quality among Finnish arital couples. Journal of Family Issues, 19, 705-724.

Rice, D. Cummins, P. (1996). Late adolescent and parent perceptions of attachment: an exploratory study of personal and social well being. Journal of counseling and Development, 75, 50-57.

Rollins, B.C., and Thomas, D. L. (1979). Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children. In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I Nye, and I. L. Reiss (EDS.), Contemporary theories about the family (Vol. 1, pp. 317-364). New York: Free Press.

Sroufe, L. A. (1978). Attachment and the Roots of Competence. Human Nature, 1(10), 50-57.

Waters, E. (1993). The stability of individual differences in infant attachment: Comments on the Thompson, Lamb, and Estes contribution. Child Development, 54, 516.

Assigned Responsibilities Page

This study was conceptualized and initiated by Regina Peacock. She was the lead writer for the Literature Review, the Research Design and Methods, and the Results sections. She was also primarily responsible for gathering and analyzing the data for this study, assembling the appendices, and providing most of the references.

J.C. Fisher was primarily responsible for writing the Abstract, Summary, Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations. He also had the task of formatting and editing the paper so that the language and style was consistent. J.C. also assisted in doing research on Attachment and Parenting Styles and contributed extensively to the Literature Review. The Problem Statement and Problem Focus resulted from a collaborative effort made by both authors.